arXiv:0807.3461v2 [math.NT] 23 Jul 2008

A SIMPLE PROOF THAT ANY ADDITIVE BASIS HAS ONLY FINITELY MANY ESSENTIAL SUBSETS

BAKIR FARHI

Département de Mathématiques, Université du Maine,
Avenue Olivier Messiaen, 72085 Le Mans Cedex 9, France.
bakir.farhi@gmail.com

Abstract. Let A be an additive basis. We call "essential subset" of A any finite subset P of A such that $A \setminus P$ is not an additive basis and that P is minimal (for the inclusion order) to have this property. A recent theorem due to B. Deschamps and the author states that any additive basis has only finitely many essential subsets (see "Essentialité dans les bases additives, *J. Number Theory*, **123** (2007), p. 170-192"). The aim of this note is to give a simple proof of this theorem.

MSC: 11B13

Keywords: Additive basis; Asymptotic basis; essential subsets of a basis.

1. Introduction

An additive basis (or simply a basis) is a subset A of $\mathbb{Z}$, having a finite intersection with $\mathbb{Z}^-$ and for which there exists a natural number h such that any sufficiently large positive integer can be written as a sum of h elements of A. The smaller number h satisfying this property is called "the order" of the basis A. Given a basis A, an element x of A is said to be "essential" if the set $A \setminus \{x\}$ is not a basis.

Erdös and Graham[2] proved that an element x of a basis A is not essential if and only if $\gcd\{a-b \mid a, b \in A \setminus \{x\}\} = 1$. Actually, these two authors proved this result in the particular case $x = 0 = \min A$, but, as remarked by Grekos[3], it suffices to translate A by $(-x)$ to obtain the generalization. In [4], Nash and Nathanson obtained the following more general result: Let A be an additive basis and F be a finite subset of A. Then the set $A \setminus F$ is a basis if and only if $\gcd\{a - b \mid a, b \in A \setminus F\} = 1$.

Using the Erdös-Graham's characterization, Grekos[3] showed that the set of the essential elements of a basis A is always finite and its cardinal can be bounded above in function of the order of A. Recently, Deschamps and the author[1] have extended the concept of essential element to those of "essentiality" and "essential subset" which they have defined as follows:

Definition 1 ([1]). *Let A be an additive basis. We call "essentiality" of A any subset P of A such that $A \setminus P$ is not a basis and that P is minimal, for the inclusion order, to have this property (so if $Q \subsetneqq P$ then $A \setminus Q$ is a basis).*
A finite essentiality of A is called an "essential subset" of A.

Examples:

1) The set $A = \{6k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{1, 5\}$ is easily seen to be a basis of order 4. The finite subset $X = \{1, 5\}$ of A is an essential subset of A, because $A \setminus X = \{6k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is not a basis while each of the two sets $A \setminus \{1\} = \{6k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{5\}$ and $A \setminus \{5\} = \{6k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{1\}$ constitutes a basis.

Date: **July 22$^{\text{nd}}$, 2008.**

2) In the basis $\mathbb{N}$, each of the two complementary subsets $\{2k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{2k+1 \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ constitutes an infinite essentiality. Indeed, none of those sets is a basis but it suffices to add to one of them an element of its complementary to obtain a basis.

The number of all essentialities of a basis may be infinite. For example, we easily verify that for all prime number p, the set $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{pk \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ constitutes an essentiality of the basis $\mathbb{N}$. So, since the set of prime numbers is infinite then the basis $\mathbb{N}$ contains an infinitely many essentialities. However, the set of all essential subsets of a basis is always finite as recently shown by Deschamps and the author [1] in the following:

Theorem 2 ([1], Theorem 10)**.** *Any additive basis has only finitely many essential subsets.*

In addition, it has been shown in [1] that (contrary to the set of essential elements) the cardinal of the set of the essential subsets of an additive basis cannot be bounded above by a function of the order of the basis alone, but it can be bounded above in function of another parameter related to the basis. Below, we give an alternative proof of Theorem 2. However, although our proof is more simple than that of [1], it does not permit to bound from above the finite cardinal in question.

2. A SIMPLE PROOF OF THEOREM 2

For the following, if P is an essential subset of an additive basis A, we write

$$\mathrm{d}(P) := \gcd\{x - y \mid x, y \in A \setminus P\}.$$

Further, if n is a positive integer, we note $\omega(n)$ the number of its distinct prime factors.

We begin by recalling Lemma 11 of [1], which constitutes the main tool of this paper.

Lemma 3 (Lemma 11 of [1])**.** *Let A be an additive basis and P_1 and P_2 be two distinct essentialities of A such that $P_1 \cup P_2 \neq A$. Then we have $\mathrm{d}(P_i) \geq 2$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\gcd(\mathrm{d}(P_1), \mathrm{d}(P_2)) = 1$.*

Proof. Fix $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and let $x \in P_i$. Then, because P_i is an essentiality of A, the set $(A \setminus P_i) \cup \{x\}$ is a basis while the set $A \setminus P_i$ is not a basis. Hence x is an essential element of $(A \setminus P_i) \cup \{x\}$. This implies (according to the result of Erdös-Graham[2] and Grekos[3], cited in §1) that $\mathrm{d}(P_i) \neq 1$; that is $\mathrm{d}(P_i) \geq 2$ as required.

In order to prove that $\gcd(\mathrm{d}(P_1), \mathrm{d}(P_2)) = 1$, let us argue by contradiction. So, assume that there exists $d \geq 2$ such that $d | \mathrm{d}(P_1)$ and $d | \mathrm{d}(P_2)$. Fix $t \in A \setminus (P_1 \cup P_2)$ and put $B := A \setminus (P_1 \cap P_2)$. For all $x \in B$, we have $x \notin P_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$, thus $d | \mathrm{d}(P_i) | (x - t)$, so $x \equiv t \bmod(d)$. We deduce from this last fact that B cannot be a basis (because all the elements of B belong to the same residue class modulo $d \geq 2$). But since $P_1 \cap P_2 \subset P_1$, $P_1 \cap P_2 \subset P_2$ and P_1 and P_2 are essentialities of A, it follows that $P_1 \cap P_2 = P_1 = P_2$, which contradicts our hypothesis that $P_1 \neq P_2$. Hence $\gcd(\mathrm{d}(P_1), \mathrm{d}(P_2)) = 1$, as required. The proof is complete. ■

Remark 4. *If P_1 and P_2 are distinct essential subsets of an additive basis A, then the condition $P_1 \cup P_2 \neq A$ of Lemma 3 is automatically satisfied (because A is infinite while $P_1 \cup P_2$ is finite).*

Corollary 5. *Let A be an additive basis and $(P_i)_{i \in I}$ be a nonempty family of pairwise distinct essential subsets of A. Then for all $(x, y) \in A^2$, with $x \neq y$, the subset of I defined by:*

$$J_{x,y} := \{i \in I \mid x \notin P_i \text{ and } y \notin P_i\}$$

is finite.

Proof. Let us fix a couple (x, y) of A^2 such that $x \neq y$. From the definition of the set $J_{x,y}$, we clearly have:

$$\{x, y\} \subset \bigcap_{i \in J_{x,y}} (A \setminus P_i)\,.$$

This implies that for all $i \in J_{x,y}$, the positive integer $\mathrm{d}(P_i)$ divides the nonzero integer $(x - y)$. But since (according to Lemma 3 and Remark 4) the integers $\mathrm{d}(P_i)$ $(i \in J_{x,y})$ are all ≥ 2 and pairwise coprime, we deduce that their number is at most $\omega(|x - y|)$; so $\operatorname{card} J_{x,y} \leq \omega(|x - y|) < +\infty$. The corollary is proved. ■

Proof of Theorem 2. Let A be an additive basis and $(P_i)_{i \in I}$ be the family of all pairwise distinct essential subsets of A. We have to show that I is finite. If $\operatorname{card} I \leq 1$ then we are done. Assume for the following that $\operatorname{card} I \geq 2$ and let us fix $\alpha \in I$. Set for all $x \in A$:

$$J_x := \{i \in I \mid x \notin P_i\}$$

and for all $(x, y) \in A^2$:

$$J_{x,y} := \{i \in I \mid x \notin P_i \text{ and } y \notin P_i\}.$$

Also set Λ the finite subset of A defined by:

$$\Lambda := \{x \in P_\alpha \mid J_x \neq \emptyset\}.$$

This set Λ is nonempty (since otherwise we would have $P_\alpha \subset P_i$ $(\forall i \in I)$, which implies $P_\alpha = P_i$ $(\forall i \in I)$, which leads to a contradiction for any $i \in I$, $i \neq \alpha$, since the P_i's are pairwise distinct). Now, by the axiom of choice, let us associate to each element $x \in \Lambda$ (so $J_x \neq \emptyset$) an element $i(x)$ of J_x. We remark that for all $(x, y) \in A^2$ such that $x \in \Lambda$ and $y \in P_{i(x)}$, we have $x \neq y$ (because $x \in \Lambda$ implies $i(x) \in J_x$, that is $x \notin P_{i(x)}$). It follows from Corollary 5 that if a couple $(x, y) \in A^2$ satisfies $x \in \Lambda$ and $y \in P_{i(x)}$ then the subset $J_{x,y}$ of I is finite. Consequently, the subset of I defined by:

$$\widetilde{I} := \{\alpha\} \cup \{i(x) \mid x \in \Lambda\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{x \in \Lambda, y \in P_{i(x)}} J_{x,y} \right)$$

is also finite (as a finite union of finite sets).

We complete our proof by showing that in fact $I = \widetilde{I}$. The inclusion $\widetilde{I} \subset I$ is obvious. To show the second inclusion $I \subset \widetilde{I}$, let us argue by contradiction; so assume that there exists $i \in I$ such that $i \notin \widetilde{I}$. The fact $i \notin \widetilde{I}$ implies $i \neq \alpha$ which implies that the two essentialities P_α and P_i are distinct, so $P_\alpha \not\subset P_i$. Thus there exists $x \in P_\alpha$ such that $x \notin P_i$. Now $x \notin P_i$ implies $i \in J_x$ which implies $J_x \neq \emptyset$. Next $x \in P_\alpha$ and $J_x \neq \emptyset$ mean that $x \in \Lambda$, hence $i(x) \in \widetilde{I}$. But since $i \notin \widetilde{I}$, we certainly have $i \neq i(x)$. This last fact implies that the two essentialities P_i and $P_{i(x)}$ are distinct, so $P_{i(x)} \not\subset P_i$. Thus there exists $y \in P_{i(x)}$ such that $y \notin P_i$. Finally, the facts $x \notin P_i$ and $y \notin P_i$ imply $i \in J_{x,y}$ which implies (since $x \in \Lambda$ and $y \in P_{i(x)}$) that $i \in \widetilde{I}$. Contradiction. The proof is complete. ■

REFERENCES

[1] B. Deschamps & B. Farhi. Essentialité dans les bases additives, *J. Number Theory*, **123** (2007), p. 170-192.

[2] P. Erdős & R. L. Graham. On bases with an exact order, *Acta Arith*, **37** (1980), p. 201-207.

[3] G. Grekos. Quelques aspects de la Théorie Additive des Nombres, Thèse, Université de Bordeaux I, juin 1982.

[4] J. C. M. Nash & M. B. Nathanson. Cofinite subsets of asymptotic bases for the positive integers, *J. Number Theory*, **20** (1985), p. 363-372.